



REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-23 are pending in the present application with Claim 17-23 withdrawn from consideration. No claims are amended, added, or canceled by the present response.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-4 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hasegawa (U.S. Patent No. 5,862,476) in view of Teshiroji (Patent Application Publication No. U.S. 2004/0209621 A1); Claims 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hasegawa, Teshiroji, and Onodera et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. U.S. 2002/0052997 A1, herein “Onodera”); Claims 11-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hasegawa in view of Onodera; Claims 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hasegawa, Teshiroji, and Longoni (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. U.S. 2004/0213193); and Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hasegawa, Teshiroji, and Ishii (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. U.S. 2004/0203734).

The outstanding rejections of the claims based on the combination of Hasegawa and Teshiroji and other applied art is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Briefly recapitulating, independent Claim 1 is directed to a base station which includes, *inter alia*, a control information control part configured to make a communication terminal unable to recognize control information sent by the base station by controlling at least one of a control information generating part and a communications part, the control information control part making the communication terminal unable to recognize the control information when a predetermined condition is met.

The outstanding Office Action recognizes at page 3, third full paragraph, that Hasegawa, the main reference, does not teach or suggest that a control information control

part “is for making the communication terminal in the area unable to recognize the control information by controlling at least one of the control information generating part and the communications part.

To cure this deficiency, the outstanding Office Action relies on Teshiroji. More specifically, the outstanding Office Action states that paragraph [0009] of Teshiroji teaches a control information control part configured to make a communication terminal unable to recognize the control information sent by the base station by controlling at least one of a control information generating part and a communications part, the control information control part making the communication terminal unable to recognize the control information when a predetermined condition is met.

Teshiroji discloses in paragraph [0009], that when a notification of a call-connection-request refusal from a base station is sent to a mobile station, the mobile station “can not start communication, in the cell of the base station having no vacant channel-for-calling.”

However, the above paragraph of Teshiroji simply discloses that the mobile communication terminal cannot start communication (i.e., send data different from control data) with the base station when the call-connection-request refusal is received by the mobile terminal from the base station. In other words, the mobile terminal receives control data (call-connection-request refusal) from the base station but cannot send communication data (which is different from the control data) to the base station.

On the contrary, the device of Claim 1 recites that “the communication terminal [is] unable to recognize **the control information** when a predetermined condition is met” (emphasis added).

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that paragraph [0009] of Teshiroji does not teach or suggest a control information control part configured to make a communication terminal unable to recognize the control information sent by the base station by controlling at least one

of a control information generating part and a communications part, the control information control part making the communication terminal unable to recognize the control information when a predetermined condition is met, as required by Claim 1.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claim 1 and each of the claims dependent therefrom patentably distinguish over Hasegawa, Teshiroji, Onodera, Longoni, and Ishii, either alone or in combination.

The rejection of Claims 11-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hasegawa in view of Onodera is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Briefly recapitulating, independent Claim 11 is directed to a base station which includes, *inter alia*, a control information control part that generates reception-stop-instruction information which instructs a communication terminal in an area to stop receiving control information from the base station when a predetermined condition is met.

The outstanding Office Action recognizes in the paragraph bridging pages 11 and 12 that Hasegawa does not teach or suggest “a base station wherein a control information control part configured to generate reception-stop-instruction information which instructs the communication terminal in the area to stop receiving the control information when a predetermined condition is met.”

The outstanding Office Action relies on Onodera for teaching the above-noted feature that is missing in Hasegawa. More specifically, the outstanding Office Action considers that paragraph [0059] of Onodera discloses the above-noted feature.

However, paragraph (0059) of Onodera specifically teaches that a “system control section **1013** directs the CS call control section **1012** to stop transmitting control signals. The CS call control section **1012** stops transmitting control signals after the CS call control section **1012** confirm that all communication channels were busy.”

Thus, Onodera clearly disclose that the *base station*, which includes the system control section 1013 and the CS call control section 1012, stops transmitting the control signal, which is different from the claimed feature that the *communication terminal* stops receiving the control information.

In other words, in Onodera the base station ceases to send information to a communication terminal while Claim 11 recites that the communication terminal ceases receiving control information from the base station, which is different from Onodera.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claim 11 and each of the claims depending therefrom patentably distinguish over Hasegawa and Onodera, either alone or in combination.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

Remus F. Fetea, Ph.D.
Registration No. 59,140

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 03/06)